



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,965	06/29/2001	Jeong Hyun Kim	8733.472.00	6105
30827	7590	02/02/2004	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ORTIZ, EDGARDO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/893,965	KIM ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Edgardo Ortiz	2815

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 14-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited references do not disclose or suggest "*a plurality of organic pixel electrodes on the first substrate*" and "*the organic pixel electrodes connect to the thin film-transistor through the contact hole*". However, the examiner disagrees and notes that, as stated in the rejection, Applicant's admitted prior art teaches a first substrate (21), a plurality of pixel electrodes (29) on the first substrate, a passivation layer (27) over a thin film transistor, wherein the passivation layer includes a contact hole (Specification, page 4, lines 6-8) and a pixel electrode (29) formed in an active area, wherein the pixel electrode connects to the thin film transistor through the contact hole as shown in prior art figure 1.

Applicant also argues that "*AGFA discusses the use of PEDOT in the context of electroluminescent lamps only. AGFA does not suggest at all that PEDOT is suitable for use in LCD displays such as those of the present application.*" The examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion of the AGFA reference and notes that AGFA clearly discloses that PEDOT is used for transparent electrodes in thin film circuits, such as the ones in Applicant's claimed invention, and therefore AGFA clearly suggests their use in a display device as claimed, see section "PEDOT Screen Printable Pastes" of the reference. Additionally, the reference states that PEDOT can be used in "Electrodes for small flexible flat panel displays" and "High resolution patterned electrodes for plastic electronics (transistors)", thus suggesting the use of PEDOT in an invention as claimed by Applicant.

*Tom Thomas*  
Tom Thomas  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800